

REMARKS

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Crane, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,307,258).

Responsive to this, claim 3 is deleted and claim 1 is amended which is substantially the combination of original claims 1 and 3. A limitation is added in the amended claim 1 and defines that the space that is enclosed by the at least one window is larger than the at least one chips so that the whole at least one chip can be accommodated in the space enclosed by the at least one window. This feature is different from the disclosure by Crane Jr. et al. who discloses that "aperture 400 exposes a portion of at least one of the semiconductor dies(s)." This can also be seen from the drawings of Crane Jr. et al. In other words, the aperture 400 is smaller than the semiconductor so that only a portion of the at least one of the semiconductor dies(s) is exposed via the aperture.

Besides, a new claim 4 is added which includes the contents in the amended claim 1 and further includes that a periphery of the at least one of the IC chips is fitted and in contact with an inner periphery of the at least one window. This is totally different from the disclosure by Crane Jr. et al.

It is noted that because the window in the claimed structure is larger than the chip that is enclosed in the window, so that the thickness of the memory card can be controlled within the desired range while the thickness of the chip needs not to be made extra thin. On the contrary, Crane Jr. et al. discloses that the aperture is smaller than the semiconductor die so that the thickness of the cover plate affects the thickness of the memory cards.

Therefore, it is believed that, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) should be removed, and the amended claim 1 and the new claim 4 should be allowable. It is further submitted the claim 2 should be allowable as they are dependent upon the amended claim 1 which is believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

WU & CHEUNG, LLP

Dated: November 5, 2004

By: 

Charles C.H. Wu, Esq.

REG. NO. 39,081

7700 IRVINE CENTER DRIVE # 710

IRVINE, CALIF. 92618-3043

TEL: 949-251-0111

FAX: 949-251-1588

E-MAIL: CCHWU @ EARTHLINK.NET

USPTO CUSTOMER NO.: 25864